G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1892-93.
192.
(L. R.)

File No. 198

Serial Nos. 1-9

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-9

Part B for Feby 1894.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Venkatrao regarding the Patachi of Bidiserasti Village in Turvekere Sub-Talookh.—

To The Deputy Commissioner. Tumkur District.

19 13747 of 11.2.94.
P.J 95-93. Requesting him to appoint both of them as Patachi, the duties being divided between them in proportion to the Potagi allowance each is entitled to.

Indexed. Book.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Precis

A. S No. 63 of 1892-93

Appellant:-
Venkata Rau
Patel of Bidiswaste
in Turuvekere Sub Taluk

This is a dispute regarding the Pateli of Bidiswaste village in Turuvekere Sub Taluk.

The facts of the case are as follows:-

On the 20th January 1891 one Byata Rau presented a petition to the Deputy Comm:r of Tumkur that he was the registered Kulkoar Patel of Bidiswaste, that after the survey settlement the village of Bagayat had been ~~abol~~ abolished and its land:

transferred to Bidiswaka, Turuvekere Amanikere and kusba ~~Arasee~~ Turu-vekere respectively, that until the Pukka Potgi settlement Ramaswamia Patel of Bagayet village had been receiving the Patel allowances of that village in accordance with the kuteha Potgi Saumud, that out of the Potgi amount to which he (Venkata Rau) was exclusively entitled the Deputy Amildar of Turuvekere had given one half to the said Rama-swamia, that merely because some of the lands of Bagayet village had been transferred to Bidi-swaka it was not proper to allow Ramaswamia to share the Potgi amount fixed for Bidiswaka with its huckdar Patel and that orders might therefore be passed disallowing Ramaswamia's claims to any portion of the Potgi

fixed for Bidiswaske.

The Deputy Commr ordered that Petitioner Venkata Rao might represent his case to the Amildar and obtain an Endorsement from him.

24-1-91

On the 14th April 1891 Ramanna son of deceased Byata Rao above named deposed before the Deputy Amildar of Suruvekere that his father had been the registered Patel of Bidiswaske, that even during the lifetime of his father he (Ramanna) had been looking after the Patelic duties of that village, that in the year Sarana the village of Bagayet had been abolished and its lands transferred to Bidiswaske, Suruvekere Amanikere and Suruvekere Kusba, that Ramaswamia above named was claiming a share in the Patelic of Bidiswaske to which he (Ramanna)

alone was the hukdar
and that the full amount
of Potgi fixed for that
village should be paid to
him only.

The Deputy Amildar
reported to the Deputy
Commr. that the death
of Byata Rav had taken
place some two months
ago, that his name alone
still stood in the Pateli
Register, that the said
Byata Rav had left four
sons of whom one was
Venkata Rav above named,
another was Ramanna
who had been looking
after the Pateli of Bidi
swaste even during the
lifetime of his father,
that in the year Farana
the village of Bagayat had
been abolished and its
lands transferred to Bidi
-swastte, Turuvekere Amani
Kere & Turuvekere Kusba,
that Ramaswamia Patel
of Bagayat had based
his claims to a share

23.4.91

5

in the Potgi amount fixed for Bidiswaste on the ground that a large portion of the lands of Bagayet village of which he had been the Kulkoar Patel & was transferred to Bidiswaste, that the said Ramaswamia was also Patel of certain other villages whose jamabandi amounted to Rs 7000, that according to the Pukka Potgi ~~arrangement~~ settlement there should not be more than one Patel for a village, and that in his ~~opinion~~ opinion the Potgi amount fixed for Bidiswaste should be paid to the Sons of the deceased Kulkoar Patel Byata Rav and Rama Swamia should be directed to establish his claims, if any, to the said Potgi amount by a proper Suit.

The Deputy Commr there upon ordered that the Potgi amount might be

27. 4. 91

paid to the registered Patel
or his heirs that had per
formed the patelioubies.

On the 14th August
1891 Ramaswamia above
named presented a petition
to the Supt of Rev. survey
that at the abolition of
Bagayat village he had
presented a petition dated 12.8.83
~~dated~~ with respect to his
claims when an Endorse
-ment had been issued
to him that the transfer
of the lands of Bagayat
village to Bidiswaste would
not affect his right to the
Patelі, that notwithstand
-ing this at the distribution
of Potgi for the year Vikruti
the Deputy Amildar of
Turuvekere had refused
to pay him any Potgi allow
-ance stating that the Pukka
Potgi baravard had made
no mention of Potgi for
the Bagayat village, that
the asali village of Bidi
Swaste had only a jama

No 2980

bandi of Rs 200 whereas the majara village of Bagayet had Rs 1000 and that for these reasons orders might be issued allowing him the Poligi amount to which he was lawfully entitled.

14-8-91 The Survey Supt forwarded the above petition to the Deputy Commr for enquiry and disposal.

20-8-91 The Deputy Commr thereupon ordered that the petitioner Ramaswami might first ~~obtain~~ obtain an endorsement from the Amildar and afterwards appeal against it.

On the 24th October 1891 Ramaswamia presented another petition to the Supt of Survey regarding his claims referred to above the petition was forwarded to the Deputy Commr whereupon the Deputy

29-12-91 Commr directed the Dy Amildar of Turuvekere to submit the records in the case with a report

as to who had performed the pateli outies of Bagayet village since the Pukka Potgi settlement and as to how the Potgi amount had been distributed.

The Deputy Amildar thereupon reported that 31-1-92
the Pukka Potgi settlement had been made in 1889-90, that ao Ramaswamia above named had assisted the baravardoar in the collection of that year's duties, both the baravardar and Ramaswamia had been paid the Potgi amount, that in 1890-91 Ramaswamia had failed to do the pateli duties which was mainly due to his having been the Patel of other villages whose jamabandi amounted to Rs 7000, that the sons of deceased Byata Rao had all along performed the pateli duties and that the office had also been registered in the name of Venkata Rao

9

5

who was a son of the
baravarodar.

This report was
forwarded by the
Dy Commr to the Supt
8-2-92 of survey.

Upon a further
reference by the Supt
5-4-92 of survey, the Deputy
Commr reported that
Ramaswamia had
originally been the pate
of Bagayet, that at the
abolition of that villay
a large portion of its
lands was transferred
to Bidiswaste, that at
the Pukka Potgi settle-
ment the Potgi had
been fixed for the
villages, to which the
lands of Bagayet were
~~lastly~~ transferred, in
proportion to their in-
creased jamabandi,
and that as the quesn
of Potgi was one to
be decided in the survey
Dept it ~~was to be decided~~
there.

opinion was solicited
as to how the matter
should be settled.
Further information
was called for by the
Supt of Survey and the
Dy amildar ~~was therefore~~
was therefore directed
by the Deputy Comm:
to furnish the necessary
information.
The Dy amildar accord-
-ingly reported to the 30-4-92
Dy Comm: ~~as follows~~:

"~~The above report~~
that out of 182 acres
10 gs assessed at Rs 900-12-0
which originally belonged
to Bagayat village 25 acres
16 gs assessed at Rs 35-8
were transferred to Kusba
Turuvekere, 13 acres 5 gs
assessed at Rs 61-4-0 to
Turuvekere Amanikere,
and 143 acres 29 gs assessed
at Rs 804-0-0 to Bidi
Swaste, that Venkata
narania and Ramaswamia
had been the Shanbhog
and the patel respectively
of Bagayat village, that

till the year Survasham they had been receiving the Kutcha Potgi allowances and that at the Pukka Potgi settlement the village of Bagayat had been left out.

6.5.92 This information was communicated to the Supt of Rev Survey.

16.5.92 The Supt of Survey thereupon ~~expressed his opinion~~ decided that as the revenue derived from the lands transfered to Kuda Turuvekere was only Rs 35-8-0 and that derived from the land, transfered to Turuvekere Amanikere was also but a small sum viz Rs 61-4-0 they need not be taken into consideration at all and that as the total jamabandi of Divisions with the newly added

lands of Bagayat village was shewn to be Rs 1036 and the jamabandi of Bagayat village alone was Rs 804 it would be proper to allow the hukoor patel of Bagayat and the Patel of Bidiswaste to perform the Patelships of ~~Kas~~ Bidiswaste village by rotation, the ~~former~~ latter holding the office for one year and the former for four years.

The Deputy Commr thereupon ordered the Deputy amildar of Tumkur to carry out the above arrangement. 19.5.92

It is against the above decision of the Asst Supt that Venkatakar (appellant) has appealed to Govt:

The appellant states:

1 That the village of

Bagayat has been from the beginning "becheraki"

ii That on the abolition of Bagayat village its Shanbhag was dispensed with.

iii That the lands of Bagayat have been transferred not merely to Bidiswaste but also to other villages.

iv That in the year Vikruti the whole of the Palji was paid to him (appellant) only.

v That the Deputy Amildar has all on a sudden ~~dismissed~~ put Ramaswamia (above named) in charge of the office.

Off. Memo No. 682 of 15-11-92

The Deputy Commr was requested to report in the matter.

The Deputy Commr in his no. 514 of 21-12-92 also gives the facts of the case.

The Deputy

Comm: was further requested to report as to what was the jamabundi of Bidiswaste prior to Jarana, as to what portions thereof were transferred to the adjoining villages in Jarana and whether Petitioner was allowed any share in the Salgi sanctioned for those villages in consideration of such transfer.

16121 of 29-3-93
1238

In reply the Deputy Comm: stated that Bidiswaste was not abolished but the village of Bagagat.

817 of 7.4.93

A reminder was sent to the Deputy Comm: to report on the above points, since his reply No. 817 of 7.4.93 was not to the point.

17645 of 27.4.93
278.92

The Deputy Comm: now reports that the jamabandi of Bidi Swaste prior to Jarana (1884-85) was Rs 230.15.4, that no portion of the said

note — In the last para of the Shanbhags memo in the ver Prop. it is stated that a similar transfer of some lands of Bidiswaste to the adjoining villages took place in the year Jarana.

15

8

village was transferred to the adjoining villages and that a great portion of Bagayat village yielding a revenue of Rs 804 was transferred to Bidiswaske.

NCR

Pr No 63 of 1892-93

(9)

Appt
Patail Vankatayya
of Bidiswasti
Tuniekere Sub Taluq
Tuniekere Dt.

Resp
Ramaswamy
Patail of
Bagayat

Appt & Respt are Patails of two adjoining villages — Appt is Patail of Bidiswasti, & Respt is Patail of Bagayat. At the survey the village ~~Bagayat~~ Bagayat was amalgamated with 3 villages, the bulk of the lands going to the appts village as shown below.—

	Rs
Asst of lands added to Tuniekere	35
Do to Amanikere	61
Do to Bidiswasti	804
	900

Prior to the amalgamation the Revenue of Bidiswasti was only Rs 230

to the powers given by the Act of ...

Her Lordship decided that under the circumstances of the case, the Office of Patoile of the ~~Arrondissement~~ enlarged Rectory of Ballinasloe should be held ~~jointly~~ by the appellant & Respondent & duties done by them by rotation ~~of the~~ appellant holding the office for one year after every 4 years during which ~~4 & 5 years respectively~~ the Respondent was to hold the office. — The appeal was against this order. —

The appellant contends that it was a hardship for him & the Respondent alternately out of office for 4 years for every 1 year of service, & says that he is ready to give Respondent her share of Patoile if he (appellant) is allowed to continue in office. — The Respondent is also willing to give appellant her share of Patoile if he is kept in sole charge of the Office. —

The Lord Chancellor of Ireland said instead of keeping either the appellant or Respondent out of Office for any ~~part~~ period,

A warrant be issued in favour of both of them ~~can~~ be appointed as Patwaris for the duties being divided between them in proportion to the Patwaji allowance each is entitled to.— The ~~Dy~~ Dy Com[r] is requested to arrange accordingly

under Govt Reso dy 30 Jan 1894

11/8/93

Mr is referred to the Dy Com[r] by whose orders have been passed

The appointment of two Patwaris for one Village is not a very satisfactory arrangement — and the proper division and appointment of work which could not be easily settled. I am therefore not quite in favor of the order proposed by the Hon'ble Mr Chentsal Rao. I would send the Proposal with the Memo for approval before issue.

15/8/93

Submitted to the Chief Secretary for Devasthanam orders

15/8/93

The D.C. may be asked to arrange
for joint Patrolship, attaching to
this Case the recent orders regarding
Patrolships of amalgamated Villages.

Eq. 1-94

Submitted to the Revenue Councillor
with a copy of the recent orders
referred to.

30/1.

seen
Asst. Dist. Commr.
Chelyuro
31/1/94

seen
GH
1/2/9

1892.

No. ~~770~~ 1176

Name of Petitioner. Venkata Rao

Village. Turvekere

Taluk. Tiptur

District. Tumkur

Date of Arzi. 2nd November

Date of Receipt. 5th November

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 4

ABSTRACT.

Petitioner resubmits, with an additional stamp of Re 1, his petition No 770 of 22.9.92 which was rejected on account of its deficiency in stamp.

S.V.
7/11

(1) St: suffck
(2) Copy of order produced
(3) Appeal in time
(4) Rule I Cl 1 of the Act Rules

Call for Rcpt with report BO
12/11/92

L.R 198-92-1

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 1176
DATE 5-11-92

PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 770
DATE 22-9-92

(1)

A.S. No 63

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1176/770
dated 2nd November 92 received at the
Dewan's Office from Venkata Rao of
Survekere, Tiptur Taluk, appealing against the Dy Comm's
order in re the Pateli of the
~~said~~ Bidiswathe village,

is forwarded, together with its four
enclosures, to the Dy Comr. Tumkur
District, for submission of
Progs with a report on the
facts of the case & on the
points taken in the petition

2. The Petn should be
returned

L.R 198-92-2

From the Dewan's No 5429 dated 21-12-92

By Order,

Draft.

15/11

For Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
15 Novr 1892.

17 N

Engd issued
17/11/92

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892-93

6700

23 DEC.

Pet 310

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

From Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

(4)

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt.
of Mysore.

Dated Campdelhal 21st December 1892.

Despatched 22nd do

Received

Enclosures No. Pos in separate Bundle

L.R 198-92-3

General No.

No. 549

Sir,

To the same dated 16th Jany 1893 from Govt

Vide Deputy's official memorandum No. 632 of the 15th ultimo.

Submitting Proceedings with report on petition from Vyathatron Patel of Bidiswara village in the Turuvekere Sub Taluk.

Petn Bor Mem
28/12

Papers for Reading on 3rd August 1893.

Pl. M. 28/12

From the Mechanic attached to Nagar, land applied for at Rs 8024 when transf & Undersettlt; but

What portion of Bid has the lands now transferred to and the Landlord what was the applt should be ascertained before

Pet can be dealt with

24/12/92

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Tumkur District

Camp Nelhal 21st December 1892

No 549

(4)

To.

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir

Adverting to your official memorandum No. 632 of the 15th ultimo forwarding for submission of Proceedings with a report a petition from Venkatalow Potail of Bidiswasti village in the Turuvekere Sub Taluk, I have the honor to state as follows.

2. The petitioner is the registered Potel of the said Bidiswasti village and one Ramasumiah of another circle called the Bagayat Village.

3. The latter village was abolished in the year Farsha (1884-85) and the fields thereof attached to the said Bidiswasti and other villages as per margin -

No. of fields -	Area A. G.	Assessment R. A. P.	
4	25 - 16	35 - 8 - 0	To Kasba Turuvekere
14	13 - 5	61 - 4 - 0	To Turuvekere Amanikere Tank
109	143 - 29	804 - 0 - 0	To Bidiswasti

4. But the Kacha Potigi allowance was however paid to Potel Ramaswamia till the year Sarwadhari (1888-89).

5. When in 1889-90 the Pakka Potigi was settled, the abolished Bagayat village was altogether omitted. He however Ramaswamia the Potel thereof assisted the Bidiswakki Potel (to whose village most of the lands of his abolished village was added) in the collection of revenue that year, the potigi allowance was distributed between them with their consent.

6. In the following year (1890-91) Ramaswamia did not assist the Bidiswakki Potel i.e. the petitioner, he having other villages yielding a revenue of Rupees 7000 to look after. He however claimed a share in the potigi allowance of Bidiswakki village. After some correspondence the Survey Superintendent decided in May 1892 that as the revenue of the

fields transferred to the Bidisvâti village from the abolished village was larger than that of the fields transferred to the other villages, the Patels of Bidisvâti and of the abolished village should do the duty of Bidisvâti by rotation of 5 and 4 years respectively. It is against this decision that the Bidisvâti Patel has now appealed to government.

7. The enclosures of your official memorandum under reply are herewith returned together with the record of the case.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner

From (5)

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

Dated 27 March 93.

Despatched 31

Received

LR 198-92-4

Enclosures No. Nil

General No. 16/21
Pet. No. 1238

Ack. Dewan's letter No 847-4 dated 27 Mar 93.

His letter No 549 dated 21 Dec: reporting on the Petition of Kanke Patel of Bidi Svasti in the Turuvekere Sub Talluk

With reference to the above, has the honor to enquire (1) what was the Jamabandi of Bidi Svasti village prior to Jarana, (2) what portions thereof were transferred to the adjoining villages in Jarana, and (3) whether Petitioner is allowed any share in the Potgi sanctioned for those villages, in consideration of such transfer.

By order

31/3

30/3

Chief Secretary

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892 · 93

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
11428.
APR. 93
Ser: 465

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

(6)

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt.
of Mysore.

L-R 198-92-5

Dated 7th
Despatched 8th } April 1893.
Received

Enclosures No. "

General No.
No. 817.

Chief Secretary's No: 16121 dt. 29th Ultimo — Pat: 1238

Reports on certain points in connection with the Bidiswasti Village in the Tumkúr Sub Talúk.

Petn Br Mrn
10/4
Information called for not having been given, draft submitted for approval.
BR 13/4

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—27-1-93.—5,000.

Tumkur District

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

No: 817. Deputy Commissioner's Office

Tumkur, 7th April 1893.

(6)

To, The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your Docket No: 16121/1238 of the 29th Ultimo enquiring what was the Jamalundy of Bidli = swasty Village prior to its abolition and transfer of its lands to the ad= joining Villages in the year Farana (1884-85), I have the honor to state that that Village was not abolished but the Village of Bagayet —. The numbers of fields transferred from the latter, the extent thereof and the Jama = bundy (or assessment) thereon and the Villages to which they were transferred are all given in the margin

We did not say it was abolished.

We did not say in our docket that it was.

the 21st December 1892 —. Most of the lands of the abolished Village having been transferred to the petitioner's Village of Bidiswasty, the Survey Superintendent ordered that the petitioner and the Potél of the abolished Village of Bagayet should do the potél duties of the petitioner's Village by turns —. It is against this arrangement that the petitioner complains. In other words he seems to ask why the lands of the abolished Village should be added to his Village and then he required to share his Potely with the Potél of the abolished Village. The latter gets no share in the Potey sanctioned for the other Villages to which portions of his abolished Village were added, as only small bits were transferred

to

to them.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

W. A. Secretan Lieutenant

Deputy Commissioner

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

Dated

Despatched 27th April 1893.

L.R 198-92-6

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 17645
Pet F. No. 278-92

His letter No. 817 dated 7th Instant

With reference to the above has the honor to state that the Deputy Commr. has not correctly read the reference made to him, No. 16121/1238 dated 2nd ultimo, inasmuch as it is not stated therein that the village of Bidiswasti was abolished; that a memorandum of the Shanbhog filed in the vernacular proceedings shows that at the re-arrangement of villages made by the Survey Deptt in Tarana, some lands of the Bidiswasti village were transferred to Turvekere and Turvekere Amanikere; and that in view to ascertain how

Petitioner was affected by such
~~an~~ transfer, information was
called for on the points noted
in the docket referred to above.

Requests ~~that~~ the information
called for may be furnished at
an early date.

By order

Mrs
25/4
18/4 for Chief Secretary

Why was this delayed for
full 12 days? Mrs

It is expl^d by the W. Munshi that through
oversight this had become mixed up
with cases to be posted for hearing. He
has not been doing well of late days
& it is probable he did not notice the draft.

25/4 Not Satisfactory. He ought to be more careful with his papers. Mrs

(General Serial No. 30.)

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

1893 94 R 63 Pet 123

From The Dy: Commissioner
Tumkúr Dt.

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt:
of Mysore.

Dated 5th July 1893.

Despatched 6th —

Received

L.R 198-92-7

Enclosures No

General No.
No. 15.

Chief Secretary's No: 1764/5
278-92
of the 25th April 1893.

Furnishes the information called for on certain points in connection with Bidisvastra Village in the Turuvékéré Sub Talúk —.

+ Putup with Petition No 2623 of 92-93

To be putup with file & precis to be continued

Rev. Dept 7/7

10/7

Dy Com Tumkur & Rev Bor ?

Transfd to Rev Dept 10/7/93

Rd 11/7/93

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Deputy Commissioner's Office

Tumkur 5th July 1893.

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

(8)

Sir,

With reference to your Docket No: 17645/278-92 of the 25th April 1893 calling for information on certain points in connection with Bidiswasthya Village in the Turuvékéré Sub Talúk, I have the honor to state that the Jamabundi of that Village prior to Sarana (1884-85) was Rupees 230-15-4. No portion of it was transferred to the adjoining Villages. But a great portion of the Bagayet Village yielding a revenue of Rupees 804 was transferred to it as stated in this Office letter No: 549 of the 21st December 1892.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

W. Ker Scatcherd

Deputy Commissioner

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 63 of 1892-93 (9)

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Patail Venkatraja of Bidiswasti Sunnekere Sub Taluk, Sirsi District

Ramaswamy Patail of Bagayat

Decision dated 1st February 94

L-R 198-92-8

Appellant and Respondent are Patails of two adjoining villages. Appellant is Patail of Bidiswasti, and Respondent is Patail of Bagayat. At the Survey the village Bagayat was amalgamated with 3 villages, the bulk of the lands going to the appellant's village as shown below:—

	Rs
Assessment of lands added to Sunnekere	35
—do— to Amanikere	61
—do— Bidiswasti	804
	900

Prior to the amalgamation, the revenue of Bidiswasti was only Rs 230. In May 1892, the Deputy Commr., according to the opinion given by the Superintendent of Revenue Survey, decided that, under the circumstances of the case, the Office of Potail of the enlarged village Bidiswasti should be held by the appellant and Respondent and duties done by them by rotation, the Appellant holding the Office for one year after every 4 years during which the Respondent was to hold the Office. The appeal is against this order.

2. The appellant contends that it is a hardship for him to be kept altogether out of office

Office for 4 years for every 1 year of service, and says that he is ready to give Respondent his share of Potāgi if he (appellant) is allowed to continue in Office. The Respondent is also willing to give appellant his share of Potāgi if he is left in sole charge of the Office.

3. The Government are of opinion that instead of keeping either the appellant or the Respondent out of Office for any period, it would be better if both of them be appointed as Potails, the duties being divided between them in proportion to the Potāgi allowance each is entitled to. The Dy: Commissioner is requested to arrange accordingly under Government

Progs. 1055 dated 3rd January 1894.

'By order'

Redraft

Chief Secretary

No. 13747 21.2.94
Pol. 7. 95-93

Copy to the Deputy Comm.r Innukwor Distrct with the Vernacular proceedings received with his No. 549 of 21st Dec.r/92

'By order'

Chief Secretary

No. 770
as 63

19-2-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

11th February 1894

19

(10)

Endorsement granted to Potail Venkatarayya of Bidiswasti, Innuvekere Sub-Taluk, Tumkur Dist.

in reply to his. Petition Registered No. 770 as 63 dated 16-9-92 appealing against the Dy: Commrs' order regarding the Patali of Bidiswasti

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ referred to the Deputy Commissioner to whom orders have been issued

2 The enc: are returned

LR 198-92-9

"By Order"

Redraft

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.